

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 through 5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, and 16 are pending. The undersigned proposes amending claims 1 and 5 to correct a grammatical error. No new matter has been added.

All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,171,415 (Kan).

Reconsideration of the pending rejections is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Pham for granting the interview of December 12, 2007. During the course of the interview, the undersigned proposed arguments consistent with those made herein. Examiner Pham agreed to give further consideration of the arguments upon submission of a written response.

Kan Does Not Teach The Recited Claim Language

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method for a search framework to provide search functionality to a web server across at least two search providers, the search framework being interposed between the web server and each of the search providers, said method comprising in the search framework:

registering a first search method adapted to perform searches on a first of said at least two search providers;

registering a second search method adapted to perform searches on a second of said at least two search providers;

registering a first response format for receiving search results from said first search provider;

registering a second response format for receiving search results from said second search provider;

detecting a request to the web server for a search on a selected search provider from among said first search provider and said second search provider, said selected search provider corresponding to a corresponding search method from among said first search method and said second search method;

providing to the web server a ubiquitous search method for performing said search utilizing said corresponding search method, the ubiquitous search method being generic with regard to any of the first and second search providers and the corresponding search methods thereof; and responding to a call from the web server to said ubiquitous search method by performing said search on the selected search provider utilizing said corresponding search method, receiving a search result from the selected search provider in a response format corresponding to said selected search provider, and providing said received search result to the web server in a ubiquitous format, the ubiquitous format being generic with regard to any of the first and second search providers and the corresponding formats thereof.

In order for a prior art reference to anticipate this claim, the recited language and its combination in the recited arrangement must be taught by the prior art. The undersigned respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach the recited language and cannot possibly teach or even suggest the recited combination.

Kan discloses a distributed network search mechanism. (Abstract). Information providers register with a hub to indicate search queries in which they are interested in receiving. (Id.) When a query request is received, the hub resolves the query request with a provider registration index. (Id.) The hub matches search query information from the query request with provider registrations to determine which providers have registered to receive search queries like the current search query. (Id.) The hub then routes the search query to matching providers according to the query routing protocol. (Id.)

Thus, Kan discloses a system wherein queries are routed to providers by a hub. In contradistinction to claim 1, Kan does not disclose “**registering a first search method adapted to perform searches on a first of said at least two search providers**” and likewise does not disclose or suggest “**registering a second search method adapted to perform searches on a second of said at least two search providers.**” The portion of Kan relied upon by the Office for the rejection (column 7 and lines 40 through 57) discloses providers registering descriptions of themselves. Kan defines that *the registration information includes metadata describing the types of queries which the provider may be able to respond to*. (Kan, Col. 7, ll. 52-54). Thus, the cited section of Kan discloses registering **types of queries**

that a provider is able to respond to. But Kan says nothing about “registering a . . . search method adapted to perform searches on a first of said at least two search providers.”

Registering *types of queries that a provider may be able to respond to* is simply **not** the same or even similar to registering *a search method for performing searches*.

Kan likewise fails to disclose or even suggest “**providing to the web server a ubiquitous search method for performing said search utilizing said corresponding search method.**” Indeed, because Kan does not teach or suggest “registering a . . . search method for performing searches,” it is not possible that Kan could teach “providing . . . a ubiquitous search method **utilizing said corresponding [registered] search method**.” The portion of Kan relied upon by the Office for the rejection (Col. 14, ll. 51-67), discloses a proxy 114 that **translates queries** formatted according to a query routing protocol to specific search engine formats for a provider. Thus, in the system disclosed by Kan, queries are received, **translated**, and sent to a search provider. But Kan says nothing about “providing to the web server a ubiquitous search method for performing said search **utilizing said corresponding [registered] search method**.” Translating queries is not the same as or even similar to “utilizing [a registered] search method.” Indeed, translating queries and transmitting the translated queries as disclosed by Kan teaches against utilizing registered search methods as recited in the claim. Had Kan utilized registered search methods, there would be no need to translate received queries.

Therefore, because Kan does not teach the recited claim language, the references do not anticipate claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom. For similar reasons, Kan does not anticipate or render obvious independent claims 5, 12, and 13 as well as the claims depending therefrom.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned respectfully submits that pending claims are allowable and the application in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Examiner Pham is invited to call the undersigned in the event a telephone interview will advance prosecution of this application.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2558/305312.01
Application No.: 10/678,714
Office Action Dated: October 16, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

Date: December 17, 2007

/John E. McGlynn/
John E. McGlynn
Registration No. 42,863

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439